

### R E M A R K S

Careful review and examination of the subject application are noted and appreciated.

### INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants' representative (Chris Maiorana) and Examiner Tse held a telephone interview on June 10, 2005. Claims 1, 12 and 13 were discussed. An agreement was reached that if claims 12, 13 and 15-10 were canceled, that claims 1-11 would be allowable. A follow up interview was held on June 13, 2005 where Examiner Tse indicated that a second Amendment After Final would need to be filed, since the first Amendment After Final was not entered. This amendment contains the same changes to claims 1-11 that were made in the Amendment After Final filed April 8, 2005. Claims 12, 13 and 15-20 have been canceled. The drawing amendment has also been presented again. The remarks regarding the 112, first rejection have been modified to reflect the agreement summarized above.

### THE OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS

Replacement FIGS. 4 and 6 are submitted herewith. As such, the objection to the drawings should be withdrawn. FIG. 4 has been amended to replace the labels to the register 3. However, the register 4 has not been changed since page 10, lines 17-18 clarifies the issue. Element 130 has not been changed, since the

### **OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION**

The objection to the claims section is traversed. The MPEP section cited (i.e., 608.01(m)) clearly states that "there is no set statutory form for claims". Since changing the heading is moot in view of current PTO practice, and the objection should be withdrawn. The objection to FIGS. 1-2 is also traversed. One of ordinary skill in the art would readily understand the figures. Evidence of such understanding can be found in the related applications cited, at least four of which have issued as U.S. Patents. Unreasonable scrutiny by the Examiner is neither appropriate or warranted.

### **CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

The objection to claims 1-11 has been obviated by appropriate amendment. While the changes do not appear to be needed in every case, Applicants' representative has made the suggested changes to advance prosecution.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112**

The rejection of claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, has been obviated by amendment and should be withdrawn. As summarized above, the amendment to claims 1-11 has obviated this rejection.

The rejection of claims 12-13 and 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, has been obviated by appropriate amendment

and should be withdrawn. Claims 12-13 and 15-20 have been canceled.

As such, the presently claimed invention is fully patentable over the cited references and the rejection should be withdrawn.


Accordingly, the present application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action by the Examiner is respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully invited to call the Applicants' representative should it be deemed beneficial to further advance prosecution of the application.

If any additional fees are due, please charge our office Account No. 50-0541.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTOPHER P. MAIORANA, P.C.



---

Christopher P. Maiorana  
Registration No. 42,829  
24840 Harper Avenue, Suite 100  
St. Clair Shores, MI 48080  
(586) 498-0670

Dated: June 13, 2005

Docket No.: 0325.00388